

REMARKS

Claim Rejections:

Claims 1-18, 45 and 82 are all of the claims that have been examined in the present application, and currently all of the claims stand rejected.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection - Claims 1, 4-7, 10 and 13-14:

Claims 1, 4-7, 10 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,281,916 to VanSteenkiste. In view of the following discussion, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection.

An initial matter, Applicant notes that claims 1 and 45 have been amended so as to further claim the present invention. Specifically, the these claims have been amended to indicate that the subtanks are communicated with the main tank in a parallel manner; at least one recording head is communicated with one subtank, and a plurality of printer units are provided, wherein each of the printer units performs printing with respect to an independent recording medium. Applicant notes that support for these claim amendments can be found at, at least, page 23, line 6 through page 24, line 3, Figs. 1 and 2.

Turning now to the Examiner's rejection, Applicant notes that VanSteenkiste discloses a configuration where a plurality of subtanks are communicated with a single recording head. Thus, Applicant notes that VanSteenkiste fails to disclose at least one recording head is communicated with one subtank in each of a plurality of printer units, as set forth in the claimed invention. As such, VanSteenkiste fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Moreover, Applicant notes that even if the Examiner takes the position that the recording head 40 is a head unit included a plurality of recording heads 42, 44, 46, 48 each of which is communicated with one subtank, VanSteenkiste still fails to show having a plurality of printer units provided, wherein each of the printer units performs printing with respect to an independent recording medium. (*See* VanSteenkiste Col. 3, Lines 1 and 2).

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that VanSteenkiste fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. As such, VanSteenkiste fails to anticipate the claimed invention as required under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, Applicant hereby requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of the above claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection - Claims 1, 3 and 9:

Claims 1, 3 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,196,668 to Bode. In view of the following discussion, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection.

Applicant notes that Bode discloses a configuration where a plurality of sub tanks 22A-22D are communicated with the main tank 24 in a serial manner. Further, the recording heads 12A-12D are contained in a single composite recording head 12 (*see* Bode col. 2, line 67 through col. 3, line 3). Thus, Bode fails to show having the sub tanks communicated with the main tank in a parallel manner, and that each of the printer units performs printing with respect to an independent recording medium, as set forth in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that Bode fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. As such, Bode fails to anticipate the claimed invention as

required under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, Applicant hereby requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of the above claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection - Claims 1-18, 45 and 82:

Claims 1-18, 45 and 82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Junya (previously applied, in view of VanSteenkiste and in further view of the Uzita and Hmelar references (both previously applied). In view of the following discussion, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection.

In this rejection, Applicant notes that the Examiner has admitted that Junya fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. However, now the Examiner is relying on VanSteenkiste to cure the deficient teachings of Junya, and asserting that it would have been obvious to combine VanSteenkiste with Junya. However, in view of the discussion above regarding the VanSteenkiste reference, Applicant submits that even if the above references were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the resultant combination would fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, as required under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion:


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116
Application Number 10/068,008

Our Ref: Q68459
Art Unit: 2861

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Terrance J. Wikberg
Registration No. 47,177

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 21, 2004